

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 10, 2007.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1-36 were pending in the Application prior to the Office Action mailed April 10, 2007.

Claims 1-15, 26, and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rana, et al. ("Java Junction," Intelligent Enterprise, April 16, 2001; referred to below as "Rana").

Claims 16-25, 27-29 and 32-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rana in view of BEA Systems (WebLogic Server 6.1, general availability date August 1, 2001; referred to below as "WebLogic Server 6.1").

II. Summary of Applicants' Response

The present Reply cancels claims 2-15, 26, and 30-32, amends claim 1 and 33-36, and adds new claims 37-41, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 16-25, 27-29, and 33-41. An Information Disclosure Statement is attached in response to the Request for Information.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) to Claims 1-15, 26, and 30-31

Claim 1

Claim 1 (as amended) states:

A system for improved implementation of a J2EE connector architecture on an application server, comprising:
a resource adapter for an Enterprise Information System;
a set of system-level contracts between the resource adapter and an application

server;

- a Common Client Interface capable of providing a client API for Java applications and development tools to access the resource adapter;

- a connection manager on the application server capable of managing and maintaining size of a pool of connections to the Enterprise Information System, wherein the connection manager matches a request for a new connection to the Enterprise Information System, through the resource adapter, with an existing and available managed connection in the pool of connections, and wherein the connection manager creates a plurality of managed connections when an existing and available managed connection is not found; and

- a set of packaging and development interfaces that provide the ability for resource adapters to plug into J2EE applications in a modular manner.

Claim 1 defines a system for improved implementation of a J2EE Connector Architecture on an application server.

The Office Action rejected Claim 1 as disclosed by Rana under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). The features of Claims 30-32 were added into Claim 1. The Office Action stated that the features of Claim 32 were not disclosed by Rana, but alleged that WebLogic Server 6.1 could be combined with Rana to reject Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Since Rana does not disclose the features of Claim 32, Claim 1 as amended by the features previously in Claims 30-32 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rana and WebLogic Server 6.1 can not be combined to make a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection against Claim 1. Application No. 10/617,909, filed on July 11, 2003, claims priority to Provisional Application No. 60/397,916, filed on July 23, 2002. Attached to this response is an Information Disclosure Statement that includes the press release announcing the general availability of WebLogic Server 6.1, dated August 1, 2001. Applicants respectfully submit that WebLogic Server 6.1 was not described in a printed publication more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent, and therefore WebLogic Server 6.1 can not be combined with Rana to make a 103(a) rejection to Claim 1 (as amended by the features previously in Claims 30-32).

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claim 1 be reconsidered.

Claims 2-15, 26, and 30-31

Claims 2-15, 26, and 30-31 were cancelled, rendering moot the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102.

IV. 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections to Claims 16-25, 27-29, and 33-26

Claims 16-25, 27-29, and 33-36

The Office Action stated that the features of Claims 16-25, 27-29, and 33-36 were not disclosed by Rana, but alleged that WebLogic Server 6.1 could be combined with Rana to reject Claims 16-25, 27-29, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Application No. 10/617,909, filed on July 11, 2003, claims priority to Provisional Application No. 60/397,916, filed on July 23, 2002. Attached to this response is an Information Disclosure Statement that includes the press release that announcing the general availability of WebLogic Server 6.1, dated August 1, 2001. Applicants respectfully submit that WebLogic Server 6.1 was not described in a printed publication more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent, and therefore WebLogic Server 6.1 can not be combined with Rana to make a 103(a) rejection to Claims 16-25, 27-29, and 33-36. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to Claims 16-25, 27-29, and 33-36 be reconsidered.

V. Request for Information

The Office Action mailed April 10, 2007, contained a Request for Information under 37 C.F.R. 1.105 to provide information regarding WebLogic Server 6.1 and earlier versions with the

J2EE Connector Architecture. An Information Disclosure Statement is attached in response to the Request for Information.

VI. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration of the claims is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, September 25, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 25, 2007

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/
Thomas K. Plunkett
Reg. No. 57,253

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910